

E 58
.M25
Copy 2

*With the Compliments of
Garrick Mallory*

ISRAELITE AND INDIAN.
A PARALLEL IN PLANES OF CULTURE.

ADDRESS

OF

GARRICK MALLORY,

VICE-PRESIDENT, SECTION H,

OF THE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE.

DELIVERED AT THE

TORONTO MEETING,

AUGUST, 1889.

SALEM PRESS PUBLISHING AND PRINTING CO.,
1889.

*ISRAELITE AND INDIAN.
A PARALLEL IN PLANES OF CULTURE.*

ADDRESS

OF

GARRICK MALLERY,

VICE-PRESIDENT, SECTION H,

OF THE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE.

DELIVERED AT THE

TORONTO MEETING,

AUGUST, 1889.

2
2 3
2 3
2 3
2 3

SALEM PRESS PUBLISHING AND PRINTING CO.,
1889.

E 58

M 25

Copy 2

2

ADDRESS

BY

GARRICK MALLERY,

VICE PRESIDENT, SECTION H.

ISRAELITE AND INDIAN.

A PARALLEL IN PLANES OF CULTURE.

AXIOMS and postulates long limited man's study of man. This hampering has been most marked in reference to America, which it was agreed must have been peopled from the eastern hemisphere, and that the languages, religions and customs found here must have been inherited from nations registered in Eurasian records. Whatever was found here was through descent or derivation, the conceptions of autogeny and of independent growth by which men in the same plane of culture act and think alike not having arisen to explain observed facts.

Many authors have contended that the North American Indians were descendants of the "ten lost tribes of Israel." Prominent among them was James Adair, whose work, highly useful with regard to the customs of the southeastern Indians, among whom he spent many years, was mainly devoted to proof of the proposition. The Rev. Ethan Smith is also conspicuous, and even the last book discussing the Indians, published last year, bearing the comprehensive title "The American Indian," favors the same theory.

The argument that the Indians are descended from the "lost tribes" is weakened by the fact, now generally accepted, that those tribes were not lost but most of the people were deported and absorbed, their traces being left during centuries, and others fled to Jerusalem and Egypt. If any large number of them had remained in a body and had migrated at any time long before the Columbian discovery, but later than the capture of Samaria in the seventh

century B. C., their journey from Mesopotamia to North America would have required the assistance of miracles that have not been suggested except perhaps in the book of Mormon.

The authors of the school mentioned have for their excuse the fact, which I freely admit with greater emphasis, that an astounding number of customs of the North American Indians are the same as those recorded of the ancient Hebrews; but the lesson to be derived from the parallel between the Indians and the Israelites is very different from that of the descent advocated.

For brevity, the term Indians may be used—leaving the blunder of Columbus where it belongs—without repeating their designation as North American, as I shall not treat of the aboriginal inhabitants south of the United States. This neglect of Mexico, Central and South America is not only to observe my own limits, but because some of the peoples of those regions had reached a stage in advance of the northern tribes. To avoid confusion, the term Israelites may designate all the nation. Although the tribes became divided into the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, when it is necessary to speak of the northern tribes they may be designated as the kingdom of Samaria. The shortest term, Jews, would be incorrect, as the people scattered through the world and called “Jews” are chiefly the descendants of the southern branch or fractional part of the children of Israel and have a special history beyond that common to them with their congeners.

The parallel presented is not selected because the two counterparts are more similar to each other than each of them is to other bodies of people among the races of the earth. I readily admit that a similar parallel can be drawn between both the Indians and the Israelites and the Aryan peoples from which I and most of my hearers are supposed to have descended. The selection is made for convenience, because this audience is supposed to be familiar with the Old Testament, so that quotations and citations are unnecessary; and also because many of them in this, the anthropologic section, are familiar with the Indians, so that the collocation of facts without a prolix statement is sufficient for comparison.

Although the Indians are divided into fifty-eight linguistic stocks and three hundred languages, and there is great variety in their manners, customs and traditions, yet there is sufficient generic resemblance between all of them to allow of typical instances, where the European civilization and missionary influence have not

effected a change or where the early authorities are reliable. It is essential to examine the other side of the parallel — the Israelites — at a period coincident in development with that of the Indians. The history and records of the Israelites must be chiefly considered regarding the times before they had formed a nationality and had become sedentary. Nearly contemporaneous with that nationality was the general use of writing, and it would appear that the era of King David would be a demarcating line. The Indians, never having arrived at the stage of nationality, though some of them (as the Iroquois and the Muskoki) were far on the road to it, and never having acquired a written language, their stage at the Columbian discovery, allowing for the differences among themselves, shows a degree of development similar to that of the Israelite patriarchal period and the early Canaanite occupation before the rule of kings.

The argument, strongly urged, derived from an alleged similarity between the Hebrew and some Indian languages, especially in identity of some vocables, is not to be considered. Perhaps the most absurd of all the coincidences insisted upon by Adair was the religious use of sounds represented by him to be the same as the word Jehovah. As the deported Israelites did not pronounce the name given in the English version as “Jehovah,” and the mode of its spelling and pronunciation is at this moment in dispute—generally given as Jahveh—it would be very remarkable if the tribes of Indians supposed to be descendants of the lost ten tribes of Israel, should at this time know how to pronounce a name which their alleged ancestors did not possess or at least did not use.

Father Lafiteau was so much excited by coincidence in sound of some of the Iroquoian names and expressions with the language of the ancient inhabitants of Thrace and Lycia, that he based thereon a theory of descent. On similar grounds ancestors of the Indians have been found among the Phœnicians, Scandinavians, Welsh, Irish, Carthaginians, Egyptians, Tartars, Hindus, Malays, Chinese, Japanese and all the islands of Polynesia. It is not wonderful that, with the choice of three hundred Indian languages besides their dialects from which to make selections of sounds, some one should be likened to any other language, for any languages that are spoken can, in that manner,—*i. e.*, by a comparison of vocables—show identity of sound and a percentage of coincidences of significance. Philology now makes different rules of comparison.

It is important to establish the time when writing was first known among the Israelites, because then the traditions would first become fixed. No reliable history can exist before writing. What people remember are fables and myths; from those must be winnowed the history of the time when the people could not write. There is no reason to suppose that the Hebrew language was written at the time of the exodus though some mnemonic system might have been used. If Moses had all the knowledge of the Egyptians he could not have used any better mode of writing than their hieratic, in which it was not possible to write intelligibly any long document in the Hebrew language, simply because the advance made by the hieratic, in which the use of phonetics began, was not sufficient to be adapted to the Hebrew vocables.

There has been an attempt to show that the old Hebrew alphabet, which has been classed as partly Phœnician and partly Babylonian, was obtained from Assyria at a time before the exodus, but the theory is not yet established. Even if Assyrian characters adaptable to the Hebrew language did then exist it is not probable that the Israelite herdsmen did so adapt them with current use.

The compilers of the Old Testament, as we now have it, felt no doubt that the law could have been written on Mount Sinai. They knew how to write and so did their fathers, and it did not occur to them that there had ever been a time in which persons of the higher classes were ignorant of writing.

It is probable that in the days of Samuel the Israelites had made some progress in the art of writing. An alphabet had been known to some of them before, but a common use is of greater consequence and that depends much upon the substances used for writing, their cost and the convenience of procuring them. The people did write under David at, perhaps, about 1100 B. C.

Moses flourished about fifteen centuries before Christ, and the oldest legends relating to him are, in their present shape, four or five centuries later than his death. He did not practically organize any formal state of society, or if he did, temporarily, by his personal power, it had no direct consequence or historical continuity. The old system of clans and religion continued as before. If the legislative portion of the Pentateuch was the work of Moses it remained a dead letter for centuries and not until the reign of Josiah became operative in the national history.

The historical account undoubtedly states that Moses was, by inspiration, the founder of the Torah; but the question is, what was that

Torah? It was not the finished legislative code. The promulgation of the law at Sinai was long after described dramatically to produce a solemn impression, representing as occurring on a momentous occasion what in fact slowly and imperceptibly grew during ages.

The code now ascribed to Moses was certainly a revised code, and in an unusual sense a mosaic work. When the Israelites attained the use of writing they did as all other people in the world did when they began to use writing; *i. e.*, they wrote out their own myths, traditions and legends as they knew them at the time of writing, unless special reasons made it desirable to manipulate them. There were such special reasons in the later history of Israel, in the contests between the Elohist and the Jahvist. When the compilers belonging to the two schools produced the two versions, intermixed and confused in the books we now have, they differed from all people in history where there was a struggle for political power, if, to suit their own views, they did not color the earlier documents, long since lost, namely: the "Book of the Wars of Jahveh" and the "Jasar."

It is also certain that during the long time in which the traditions were transmitted orally, the growth of the nation's ideas produced a change in them without any fabrication or design.

Students who have devoted their lives to study the last compilation have been able to identify, by linguistic and historical exegesis, the fragments of the original traditions, the epic tales of the first documents, the theocratic deductions and the later sacerdotal visions, though the two versions appear on the same page and sometimes in the same paragraph. The results of this immense labor by the Hebraists of this generation have lately been presented by Renan in a popular form.

In addition to the linguistic and historical tests, the internal evidences, especially the antedating of conceptions several centuries (some instances of which will be mentioned) show that the books, as now received, were written long after the periods referred to in them.

The main document on the primitive age is the Book of Genesis, regarded for the reasons mentioned, not as literally historical, but as the tradition, written at a respectable antiquity, of an age that really existed. In examining it the historical part is discovered, not by belief in the miraculous, but by the proper comprehension of the mythical.

Much can be learned, from myths and legends, of the periods anterior to strict history. The Homeric epics are not history, yet they throw a flood of light upon Greek life a millennium before the Christian era. The ante-Islam tales and the Arthurian and Niebelungen romances of the Middle Ages are not true in fact, yet they are storehouses, preserving the social life of the days when they were composed and in a useful degree of the time embraced by the traditions. The generalizations derived from the details of ancient texts are truths obtained by induction.

It is expedient to make a disclaimer before entering upon the necessary comparisons of religions. I absolutely repudiate any attack upon any religion. Let us learn a lesson from the Indians, not only in tolerance but in politeness. One of the early Jesuit missionaries in Canada recounts how he pleased a Huron chief by his discourse upon the cosmology set forth in the Scriptures, and felt that he had secured a convert until the chief, thanking him for his information, added: "Now you have told me how your world was made, I will tell you how my world was made"; and proceeded to give the now familiar story of the woman falling from the sky and the turtle. He was perfectly satisfied that the priest should retain his belief with which his own, in his opinion, did not conflict. Doctor Franklin tells of a Susquenannoek who, after a similar lecture from a Swedish missionary, was answered in the same manner; but this missionary became angry and interrupted the Indian, whereupon the latter solemnly rebuked him with pity: "I have listened politely to what you told me; if you had been properly brought up you would have believed me as I believed you."

Religion, as accurately defined, embraces only the perficient relations between divinity and man, and the mode in which such relations operate. Popularly it includes cosmology and theology. For present convenience the broad subject may be divided into Religious Opinions and Religious Practices.

In treating it, all religious views personally entertained must be laid aside and the study conducted strictly within the scope of anthropology. A rule of science is not to use a miraculous factor when it is unnecessary. *Nec deus intersit, nisi dignus vindice nodus*. It will be recognized as puerile to explain puzzling phenomena, as was done for ages,

When solved complete was any portent odd
By one more story or another god.

If experience of observed facts and of the orderly working of the forces of nature is not sufficient for any proposed study, some minds resort to the miraculous while others humbly confess ignorance.

In anthropology, the object is to study within the category of humanity. It is undoubtedly true that in their explanation of phenomena, all the peoples of the world have resorted to revelations. Every myth or teaching is directly or indirectly through revelation; but as the revelation is on both sides of the equation, it can be eliminated from any parallel. Religious writers have often explained the differences in beliefs among the various peoples of the world on the hypothesis that religious knowledge was implanted at one time in the ancestors of all those peoples, and that the divergence now found is through decay of that supernatural information.

A distinguished cardinal was rash when, admitting that the doctrine of the devil and his command of demons was not known to the Israelites until after the Babylonian captivity, he insisted that it might be divine revelation, notwithstanding its immediate source. He said that if God made Balaam's ass speak, it would also be easy for him to provide that the heathen should give correct instruction. Doubtless. But this practically means that all revelations suiting us are true and all others false. When the judgment upon the truth or falsehood of an alleged revelation is made only in accordance with the prejudices of the judge, the subject becomes too eclectic and elastic to be considered by science. It is not allowable to impress a new hypothesis to support an older one when the requisition is for facts to convert the first hypothesis into an admitted theory.

Certain it is that the assertion of revelation cannot be dealt with in this address. To raise that point acts as a *clôture*, cutting off all debate.

RELIGIOUS OPINIONS.

The most generally entertained parallel between the Indians and the Israelites, repeated by hundreds of writers, was that they both believed in one over-ruling god. This consensus, if true, would at once establish a beatific bridge of union between the two peoples, but its iris arch vanishes as it is viewed closely.

After careful examination, with the assistance of explorers and linguists, I reassert my statement published twelve years ago, that no tribe or body of Indians, before missionary influence, entertained

any formulated or distinct belief in a single, over-ruling "Great Spirit," or any being corresponding to the later Israelite or the Christian conception of God. All the statements of the missionaries and early travellers to the opposite effect are erroneous. Even some of the earliest writers discovered this truth. Lafiteau says that the names "Oki" and "Manito" were given to various spirits and genii. Champlain said that Oki was a name given to a man more valiant and skilful than common. "Hawaneu," reduced to correct vocables, only means loud-voiced, *i. e.*, thunder. "Kitchi Manito" is not a proper name for one god, but an appellation of an entire class of great spirits. So with the Dakota term "Wakan," which means only the mysterious unknown. A watch is a wakan. The Chahta word presented as "God" for two centuries is now found to mean a "high hill."

The Indians probably had a vague idea of some good spirit or being whom they did not worship and to whom they did not pray. They prayed and sacrificed to the active daimons, concerning whom they had many myths. It is true that in their various cosmologic myths there was some vague and unformulated being who started the machinery by which the myth proceeded; but when once started no further attention was paid to such originator. Perhaps some modern advanced thinkers have no clearer definition of a great first cause.

Praise has been lavished upon the Indians because they did not take the name of God in vain. That, however, might be because they did not have any word corresponding with the English "God" either to use or misuse, which is the fact according to the best linguistic scholars, and they deserve no more praise for avoidance of profanity than for their total abstinence from alcoholic drinks before such had been invented or imported. The terms "Master of Life," "Maker of Breath" and "Great Father" were epithets merely. Perhaps there was an approach to a title of veneration when the method of their clan system was applied to supernatural persons, among whom there would naturally be a chief or great father of the "beast gods," on the same principle as there was a chieftaincy in tribes.

The missionaries who have persistently found what did not exist are not without excuse. Wholly independent of any design to force welcome answers, an interviewer who asks a leading question of an Indian can always obtain the answer which is supposed to be

desired. The sole safe mode of reaching the Indian's mental attitude is to let him tell his myths and make his remarks in his own way and in his own language. When such texts are written out, translated and studied they are of great value. It is only within about twelve years that this has been done, to the correction of many popular errors.

It is also true that in attempting to translate the epithets mentioned, the missionaries used the word which, in their own conception, was the nearest in significance. An instructive instance was where Boscana described a structure in southern California as a "temple." It was a circular fence, six feet high, not roofed in—a mere plaza for dancing; but the dancing was religious and the word "temple" was the best one he could find, by which mistake he has perplexed archæologists who sought for the ruins.

A consideration not often weighed is that the only members of the Indian tribes who are willing to give their own ideas on religious matters to foreigners, are precisely those who are most intelligent and most dissatisfied with their old stories. There were minds among them groping after something newer and better, and it would be easy to translate their vague longings into the conception of an overruling Providence. But the people made no such advance.

The missionaries who announced that the Indians were strict in the belief in one god, were much troubled by the statement of the converted native, Hiaccomes, of Martha's Vineyard, who, having enumerated his thirty-seven gods, gave them all up. This, however, was a typical instance of the truth. The Indians had an indefinite number of so-called gods corresponding with the like indefinite number of the Elohim of the Israelites before the supremacy of Jahveh.

The Biblical religion of Israel has been popularly held to be coeval with the world, but it had its own beginning by no means archaic, after which at least four hundred years were required for its development. About a thousand years before Christ it did not exist. The religious practices of David and Solomon did not materially differ from those of their neighbors in Palestine. Not until the time of Hezekiah, about 725 years before Christ, did the Israelite religion attain to a distinct formulation. Its ordinances and beliefs advanced from crudity and vagueness to ripeness and establishment. It was a system long in growth and so could not early possess authoritative documents.

The nomad Semite believed, with other barbarians, that he lived amid a supernatural environment. The world was surrounded and governed by the Elohim—myriads of active beings, seldom with distinct proper names, so that it was easy to regard them as a whole and confound them together. Yet the power bore different names in different tribes. In some cases it was called El, or Alon, or Eloah; in other cases Elion, Saddai, Baal, Adonai, Ram, Milik or Moloch.

The Elohim, though generally bound together, sometimes acted separately; thus each tribe gained in time its protecting god, whose function was to watch over it and direct it to success.

In the transition to nationality, the Israelites adopted a national god, Jahveh, who was not just, being partial towards Israel and cruel towards all other peoples. The worship of a national god is not monotheistic but henotheistic, recognizing other gods of other peoples. The work of the later prophets consisted in restoring the attributes of the ancient elohism under the form of Jahveh, and in generalizing the religious cult of a special god.

Jahveh was not at first the god of the universe, but subsequently became so because he was the God of Israel, and very long afterwards was claimed to be the only god, mainly because the Israelites claimed to be the peculiar people. Even down to the time of the prophet Isaiah, there were intermittent conflict and co-ordination between Baal together with the other gods of Canaan and Jahveh.

The revolution accomplished by the prophets did not change expressions. The word Jahveh was too deeply rooted to be removed, and the people spoke of Jahveh as they had formerly spoken of the Elohim. He thus became the supreme being who made and governed the world. In time even the name of Jahveh was suppressed and its utterance forbidden; and it was replaced by a purely theistic word meaning the Lord. Undoubtedly the prophets, at the time of the Kings and later, taught the worship of one God, but the people were not converted to the doctrine until after the great Captivity.

When established in Palestine, the Israelites entered into communion with their Canaanite kindred and worshipped Baal. With less apparent reason they frequently bowed down to the Dagon of the Philistines and the Ashtarothe of the Phœnicians. Solomon introduced the service of the Sidonian Astarte, which was intermitted, but later, Ahab established the worship of the Sidonian divinities in the Kingdom of Samaria. It was subsequently re-adopted in the

kingdom of Judah, and not until the reign of Josiah were their altars finally demolished.

The true parallel, therefore, between the Indians and the Israelites, as to belief in a single overruling god is not that both, but that neither, held it.

In the stage of barbarism all the phenomena of nature are attributed to the animals by which man is surrounded, or rather to the ancestral types of these animals, which are worshipped. This is the stage of zoötheism. Throughout the world, when advance was made from this plane, it was to a stage in which the powers and phenomena of nature are personified and deified. In this stage the gods are anthropomorphic, having the mental, moral and social attributes of men, and afterwards having the forms of men. This is the stage of physitheism. The most advanced of the Indian tribes showed evidence of transition from zoötheism to physitheism. The Israelites, in the latter part of the period selected, showed the same transition in a somewhat higher degree than the Indians did when their independent progress was arrested.

It is needless to enlarge upon the animal gods of the Indians, or to furnish evidence that they gave some vague worship to the sun, the lightning, to fire and winds.

There is no doubt that the Israelites were for a long period in the stage of zoölotry. They persisted in the worship of animal gods : the golden calf, the brazen serpent, the fish-god and the fly-god. The Second Commandment is explicitly directed against the worship of the daimons of air, earth and water, which is known to have been common ; and the existence of the prohibition shows the necessity for it, especially when formulated, after the practice had existed for centuries, by a religious party which sought to reform it.

The God of Sinai was a god of storm and lightning, which phenomena were strange to the Israelites after their sojourn in plains. The ancient local god of the Canaanites began in the exodus to affect the religious concepts of the Israelites so that they identified Jahveh with the god whose lands they were planting and whose influence they felt. Sinai was thenceforward the locality of their theology. Jahveh, through all changes, remained there as his home ; he spoke with the voice of thunder and never appeared without storm and earthquake.

Another class of gods connected with beast worship and also with the totemic institution (to be hereafter specially noted) was tutelar, the special cult of tribes, clans and individuals. It was conspicuous both among the Israelites and the Indians.

Jahveh, according to all that is known, may first have been a clan or tribal god, either of the clan to which Moses belonged or of the clan of Joseph, in the possession of which was the ark. No essential distinction was felt to exist between Jahveh and El, any more than between Ashur and El. Jahveh was only a special name of El which had become current within a powerful circle, and which, therefore, was better fitted to become the designation of a national god. When other tutelar gods did not succeed, there was resort to Jahveh, probably in the early instances, because he was the most celebrated of all the tutelar gods, and the reason for that celebrity was that the most powerful of the clans claimed him as tutelar.

Hecastotheism is a title given to the earliest form of religion known, which belongs specially to the plane of savagery. In it every object, animate or inanimate, which is remarkable in itself or becomes so by association, is a *quasi* god. The transition between savagery and barbarism, as well as between the religions of hecastotheism and zoötheism connected with them, was not sharply marked, so that all their features could exist at the same time at a later era, though in differing degrees of importance.

This intermixture is found both among the Israelites and Indians. An illustration among many is in the worship of localities and of local gods. Conspicuous rocks, specially large trees, peculiar mountains, cascades, whirlpools and similar objects received worship from the Indians; also the places where remarkable occurrences, as violent storms, had been noted; and among some tribes the particular ground on which the fasting of individuals had taken place, with its accompanying dreams. The Indians frequently marked these places, often by a pile of stones; but the Dakotas, when they did not have the stones, used buffalo skulls.

In the Old Testament frequent allusions are made to a place where dreams or remarkable events occurred becoming holy. They were designated by pillars. The Israelite compilers adopted the pillar of Bethel for the same reason that required Mohammed to adopt the Caaba. They could not, while struggling for monotheism, always directly antagonize the old hecastotheism.

Future state.—The topic of a future state may be divided into

(1) the simple existence of the soul after death, (2) the resurrection of the body, and (3) the rewards and punishments in the next world.

The classical writers often distinguished two souls in the same person—one that wandered on the borders of the Styx until the proper honors had been given to the corpse; and the other was a shadow, image or simulacrum of the first, which remained in its tomb or prowled around it. The latter could be easily invoked by enchanters.

Some of the Indians thought that the souls of the dead passed to the country of their ancestors, from which they did not dare to return because there was too much suffering on the road forward and backward. Nevertheless, they believed that there was something spiritual which still existed with their human remains and they tell stories of it. Thus there are two souls, and the Dakotas have four, one of which wanders about the earth and requires food, the second watches over the body, the third hovers around the village, and a fourth goes to the land of spirits.

The Iroquois and Hurons believed in a country for the souls of the dead, which they called the "country of ancestors". This is to the west, from which direction their traditions told that they had migrated. The soul must go there after death by a very long and painful journey, past many rivers, and at the end of a narrow bridge fight with a dog like Cerberus, and some of them fall into the water and are carried away over precipices. In a manner difficult to understand, this road is all on the earth; but several of the Indian tribes consider the milky-way to be the path of souls, those of human beings forming the main body of the stars, and the dogs, which also have souls, running on the sides. In their next world the Indians do precisely the same as they customarily do here.

The Israelites believed in a doubling of the person by a shadow, a pale figure, which after death descended under the earth and there led a sad and gloomy existence. The abode of these poor beings was called Sheol. There was no recompense, no punishment. The greatest comfort was to be among ancestors and resting with them. There were some very virtuous men whom God carried up that they might be with him. Apart from these elect, dead men went to oblivion. Man's good fortune was to have been accorded a number of years, children to perpetuate his family and his memory to be kept in respect after his death.

The Indians did not believe in death as a positive state. The spirit does not wholly leave the body and the body is not resurrected. Perhaps a good instance of their belief is that of a tribe of Oregon Indians who, hearing the missionaries preach on the resurrection, immediately repaired to an old battle-field and built great heaps of stones on the graves of their fallen foes to prevent their coming up again. They did not want any of that.

Among the Israelites the resurrection of the body was a foreign idea imbibed during the captivities in Assyria and Babylonia. Perhaps the first reference made to it is in the prophet Daniel. It was not fully believed in so late as the procuratorship of Pontius Pilate.

Among the Indians privation of burial and funeral ceremonies was a disgraceful stigma and cruel punishment. There was trouble about children who died shortly after their birth, and also about those whose corpses were lost, as in the snow or in the waters. In ordinary cases of death the neglect of full and elaborate ceremonies caused misfortune to the tribe.

The story of the "happy hunting ground" among the Indians has not been generally apprehended. As regards what we now consider to be moral conduct there was no criterion. A good Indian was one who was useful to his clan and family, and was, at the time of his death, not in a condition of violating the clan rules, for which the Polynesian word *tabu* has been adopted. The moral idea of goodness of a Pawnee chief is to be a successful warrior or hunter. The actual condition at the time of death decided the condition in the future life far more than any conduct during life. In the portions of the continent where the scalp was taken, the scalped man remains scalped in the world of spirits, though some tribes believed that scalping prevented his reaching that world. If he had but one leg or eye here, he had but one leg or eye afterwards. In tribes where they cut off the ears of slain foes the spirit remains without ears. A special instance is where the victim was considered too brave to be scalped, but the conquerors cut off one hand and one foot from the corpse to keep him from inflicting injury upon the tribe of the conquerors in the next world. If an Indian died in the night some of the tribes thought that he remained in total darkness ever afterwards.

One of the most curious of their beliefs was in connection with drowning and hanging, the theory being that the spirit (which was

in the breath) did not escape from the body. This doctrine was made of special application to prevent suicide which was generally performed either by hanging or drowning, the deduction being that suicides could not go to the home of the ancestors.

It is probable that the various trials by which the spirit is supposed to reach the other world, which were very numerous in the different tribes, were invented to secure confidence in the absence thereafter of the ghosts of the dead, because the same difficulty would attend their return. As without the assistance of the mortuary rites, given at the time of death and sometimes for considerable periods afterwards, the ghosts would not be able to reach their final home, there being no repetitions of those rites to assist their return, their absence was secured. Fear of the ghosts, not only of enemies but of the dearest friend, generally prevailed. After a death all kinds of devices were employed to scare away the spirit. Sometimes a new exit was cut through the wigwam, through which the corpse was taken, and afterwards filled up, it being supposed that the spirit could reënter only by the passage through which it went out. Sometimes the whole wigwam was burned down. There was always a long period which travellers called that of mourning during which drums and rattles were used to drive away the spirits. After firearms were obtained they were discharged in and around the late home of the deceased with the same object. The loud cries of so-called lamentation had probably a similar origin, and this is more marked when the lamenters were strangers to the dead, and even professionals, not unlike the Irish keeners.

In this general connection it is proper to allude to the common abstinence from mentioning the true name of any dead person. This is more distinct than the sociologic custom where the man's true name should not be used in his life except on special occasions. There was some fear that, by calling his name, he might come back.

It would be wrong to accuse the Indians of want of feeling indicated by their horror of the dead. In one of the most ancient accounts — that of Cabeza de Vaca — it is declared that the parents and other relatives of the sick show much feeling while life remains but give none to the dead—do not speak of them or weep among themselves or make any signs of grief or approach the body. This domestic reticence is entirely different from but not antagonistic to the obligatory mortuary rites which were practised.

To secure the living from the presence of the spirits of the dead was the first object, and the second was to assist those spirits in the journey to their destination. These were the prevailing ideas of all the mortuary customs of the Indians. It may be true that there was in some cases, though missionary influence is to be suspected, a belief that there were two different countries (sometimes called towns) in which the bad and the good would severally remain, but that was not of general acceptance. There was but one future country, and the only question was whether the spirits got there or not. There was no hell.

The Israelites, in their sacred books, do not show the influence of fears or hopes concerning a future state with reference to individual morality. Among them death was not an inevitable necessity, but an infliction as a punishment and their signs of mourning were acts of penitence and contrition, with the idea that the survivors might have been the cause of the death. All deaths were classed with public calamities, such as pestilence, famine, drought or invasion, being the work of an enemy—perhaps a punishing god, perhaps a daimon or a witch. They regarded it so great an evil to die unlamented that it was one of the four great judgments against which they prayed, and it was called the burial of an ass. It is however questionable whether rites attending upon death were not with them similar in intent to those of the Indians; *i. e.*, to provide, by means of those rites, for the future welfare of the departed, rather than in accordance with our modern sentiment, to show respect. Passages of the Old Testament may be noted, *e. g.*, the one telling how the bodies of Saul and his children were rescued from Bethshan and taken to Jabesh where they were burned and the bones buried. The ceremony in this case and others seems to have been the burning of the flesh and the burial of the bones, as was frequently done by the Indians on occasions of haste, without waiting as usual for the decay of the flesh, the later gathering of the bones being at stated periods of years.

There is no evidence that the Israelites feared the corpse and its surroundings beyond that to be inferred from the ordinances concerning pollution.

RELIGIOUS PRACTICES.

There should always be a cross reference in thought between what in time became a religious practice and the earlier sociology,

which will be mentioned in its place, with which it was closely connected.

Josephus remarks about the Israelites that "beginning immediately from the earliest infancy nothing was left of the very smallest consequence to be done at the pleasure and disposal of the person himself."

The same remark would be true regarding the Indians. Their religious life was as intense and all-pervading as that of the Israelites. It is yet noticed in full effect among tribes as widely separated, both by space and language, as the Zuñi and the Ojibwa, and their practices are astonishingly similar in essence and even in many details to some of those still prevailing among us.

Among the Hurons and Iroquois, there were religious rites for all occasions, among others for the birth of a child, for the first cutting of the hair of a child, for its naming and for its puberty, for the admission of a young man into the order of warriors and the promotion from warrior to chieftaincy; for the making of a mystery-man, for the putting of a new canoe into the water, for the breaking of ground for new fields, for the sowing and harvest, to fix the time for fishing, to decide upon a warlike expedition, for marriages, for the torturing of captives, for the cure of disease, for consulting magicians, invoking the daimons and lamenting the dead.

Shamans.—Among the Indians there was frequently an established and recognized priesthood, obtained by initiation into secret religious societies, corresponding in general authority with the Levites, although the latter were instituted in a different manner, perhaps imitated from the exclusive class of the priesthood in Egypt. The shamans in all tribes derived a large part of their support from fixed contributions or fees.

Adair describes a special ceremony for the admission or consecration of a priest among the southern tribes, as follows: "At the time of making the holy fire for the yearly atonement of sin, the Sagan clothes himself with a white ephod, which is a waistcoat without sleeves, and sits down on a white buckskin, on a white seat, and puts on it some white beads, and wears a new pair of white buckskin moccasins, made by himself, and never wears these moccasins at any other time."

Similar exclusive use by the High Priest of the garments used on the day of the atonement is mentioned in Leviticus.

In addition to the organized class mentioned, there were other

professional dealers in the supernatural who may be called conjurers, sorcerers or prophets, but were independent of and often antagonistic to the regular shamans. They arrived at recognition individually by personal skill in an exhibition of supernatural power, that is, they wrought miracles to prove themselves genuine.

At the time of the exodus there were, among all the Semitic tribes, sorcerers who possessed mysterious secrets and enjoyed some of the power of the *elohim*. They were paid to curse those whose ruin was desired. Balaam was the most distinguished sorcerer of that time.

One of the most frequent purposes for employing supernatural agency was to bring on rain in time of drought. The practitioner generally tried to delay his incantations as long as possible in hopes of a meteorologic change. Sometimes, on failure, he was killed, as he was supposed to be an enemy who possessed the power he professed but was unwilling to use it; and to prevent this dangerous ordeal in a dry season, he charged in advance certain crimes and "pollutions" of the people on account of which all his skill would be in vain. The more skilful rain-makers among the Sioux and the Mandans managed not to be among the beginners, but towards the last of the various contestants. The rain would surely come some time, and when it came the incantations ceased. The shaman who held the floor at the right time produced the rain.

Frequent reference to rain-making is found in the Old Testament, in which the prophets were the actors.

The mystery-men were consulted on all occasions as sources of truth, not only to explain dreams, but secrets of all kinds, to predict future successes in war or to tell the causes of sickness; to bring luck in the hunt or in fishing; to obtain stolen articles, and conversely, to produce ill luck and disease. Their processes, together with thaumaturgic exhibitions, included some empiric knowledge, and also tricks of sleight-of-hand and magnetic passes.

The Chahta had a peculiar mode of finding the cure for disease, by singing successively a number of songs, each one of which had reference to a peculiar herb or mode of treatment. The preference of the patient for any song indicated the remedy.

The Israelites believed that diseases as well as accidents without apparent cause, and other disasters, were the immediate acts of the *Elohim* or were caused by evil spirits; therefore they relied upon prophets, magicians or enchanters for exorcism. Hezekiah's

boil was cured by Isaiah. Benhadad, king of Syria, and Naaman, the Syrian, applied to the prophet Elisha. All the people resorted to their favorite mystery-men.

Even so late as the time of Josephus it was believed that Solomon had invented incantations by which diseases were cured, and some handed down by tradition were commonly used. Incense banished the Devil, which also could be done by the liver of a fish. Certain herbs and roots had the same power. Their medical practices might be recited, with slight change of language, as those of the Indians. The farther back any examination is made into savagery and barbarism the more prevalent faith-cure appears.

Witches.—The Indians were in constant dread of witches, wizards and evil spirits; but the activity of the good spirits was not so manifest. They however told Adair how they were warned by what he calls angels, of an ambuscade, by which warning they escaped. Bad spirits, or devils, were the tutelar gods of enemies, to be resisted by a friendly tutelar. The idea of a personal Satan was not found before the arrival of the missionaries.

Among the Indians witches were often indicated by the dreams of victims, and were often killed merely upon accusation, and it is interesting to notice, with relation to comparatively modern history, that the accused frequently confessed that they were sorcerers and declared that they could and did transform themselves into animals, become invisible and disseminate disease.

A sufficient reference to the Israelites in this connection is to quote the ordinance: "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." This injunction, in the higher civilization, is observed by destroying the idea that witches ever have lived or ever can live.

Dreams and divination.—The topics of inspiration by dreams and divination by oracles may be grouped together.

The Indians supposed that with, and sometimes without, a special fasting, and other devices to produce ecstasy, the spirits or daimons manifested themselves in dreams, and it was sometimes possible in these dreams for the soul to leave the body, even to visit the abode of departed spirits.

Among the Iroquoian tribes the suggestions made by dreams were implicitly followed, not only by the dreamer, but by those to whom he communicated his dreams. For instance, an Iroquois dreamed that his life depended upon his obtaining the wife of a friend, and though the friend and his wife were living happily, and parted

with great regret, the dreamer had his wish. The same tribe had a special feast which was called the "feast of dreams," and partook of the nature of Saturnalia. Every object demanded by the dreamers must be given to them, and in some instances they were unable to remember their dreams, and the special interposition of the mystery-men was invoked to state what their dreams were in fact and what was their significance.

Among the invaluable reports of the Jesuit missionaries, one in 1639 gives the general statement that the Indians consulted dreams for all their decisions, generally fasting in advance; that, in fact, the dream is the master of their lives; it is the god of the country and dictates their decisions, hunts, fishing, remedies, dances, games and songs.

The belief in revelations through dreams was universal, and the gift of explaining them was also a revelation. Their legends on this subject recall those about Joseph and Daniel. In addition may be quoted:

"In a dream, in the vision of the night, when deep sleep falleth upon men, in slumberings upon the bed.

"Then He openeth the ears of men and sealeth their instruction."

And in Deuteronomy a prophet is equivalent to a dreamer of dreams.

There were a variety of oracles among the Indians. Those most interesting to me are connected with pictography. Among many tribes, especially the Mandan, Hidatsa, Minnitari and Abnaki, after certain fasts and exercises various hieroglyphics deciding the questions which had been propounded appeared on rocks. They were deciphered by the shaman who had made them.

The apparatus by which Jahveh was consulted was the urim and thummin, a form of oracle described as connected with the ark. It ceased to be known in the fifth century before Christ and is now but vaguely understood. From the description and tradition it could, physically, have been worked by a custodian.

Severe fasts were probably the most common of the Indian religious practices, continued until they saw visions, sometimes for their own personal benefit, as deciding upon their names to be adopted from the advent of a guardian spirit, and sometimes for tribal advantage, the doctrine of all of them, as Father Lafiteau quaintly observes, being the same that prevailed among many people of his day, to lead the mind from gross and carnal obstructions

of the body. The real effect was to produce mental disorder. This ecstasy obtained by fasting was often accelerated by profuse sweating and the use of purgative or emetic drinks. Violent and prolonged exercise by dancing in a circle until the actors dropped in a swoon sometimes concluded the ceremonies.

The Israelite prophets were excited to inspiration by external means, such as dances and orgiastic proceedings resembling those of the dervishes and also of the Indian mystery-men. Music was a general accompaniment of the ecstasy. When they were about to prophesy, they became in a condition of frenzy, as if they were beside themselves. When Elisha sent one of the children of the prophets to anoint Jehu it was said of him: "Wherefore cometh this mad fellow?"

The Israelites, when they adored the golden calf sat down to eat and drink and then arose to dance and sing and the Indians used dance and song, or rather chant, in the same religious manner. The Hebrew festival (Hag) is closely connected with dancing in a circle.

Pollution and purification.—The subject of pollution and purification has been much and properly insisted upon as affording a striking parallel between the Israelites and the Indians. The Indians made special huts for the women, at certain periods, who were considered so unclean that nothing which they touched could be used. A Muskoki woman, after delivery of a child, was separated from her husband for three moons (eighty-four days). This may be compared with the Levitical law by which the mother of a female child was to be separated eighty days; of a male forty days; and Doctor Boudinot says that in some Indian tribes there was similar distinction between male and female children.

Among the southern Indians wounded persons having running sores were confined at a distance, as in the Levitical law, and kept strictly separate. An Israelite, dying in any house or tent made all who were in it, and all the furniture in it, polluted, and this pollution continued for seven days. All who touched a corpse or a grave were impure for the same time. Similarly, many of the Indians burned down the house where there had been a death, and all persons in it were polluted.

Many writers have asserted, as one of the excellencies of the Israelite customs, that the purification imposed upon those who had been engaged in a burial was a sanitary regulation, a measure ren-

dered expedient in a hot country. As no great proportion of the Israelites generally inhabited a country hot to the degree indicated, or had any conception of disease or the cause of death, this explanation is hardly sufficient. Much later the compilers might have gained some sanitary knowledge by which the old superstition was utilized. Its true explanation is from supernatural, not from natural concepts. It is probably connected with a point mentioned before; *i. e.*, the avoidance of corpses from the fear of the spirit of the dead and of the bad spirit which had caused the death, and the purificatory ceremony was for the demon, not for the disease. The neglect of sanitation is well illustrated among the Navajo, who are little affected by civilization. Upon the death of one of their members they block up the shelter containing the corpse and from fear of the spook or of the agent of death, or of both, not from fear of the corpse itself, never again visit it. Other tribes pile stones on the corpse which prevent its disturbance by beasts, but do not absorb the effluvium. Still others exposed the dead on scaffolds. To leave corpses to putrefy freely is certainly not a sanitary measure, yet it was a practice existing together with the mortuary rites before mentioned, though many of the tribes used earth burial and a few used cremation.

On a broad examination of the topic of "pollution," so styled by most writers, it seems to be best explained by our recent understanding of tabu.

Sacrifice.—Man once imagined superior forces who yet could be invoked and moved to and from any purpose. The divine world was produced in his own image and he treated its gods as he liked to be treated by his inferiors. He believed that the way to placate the forces surrounding him was to win them over as men are won over, by making presents to them. This clearly continued among the Israelites until the eighth century B. C., but it is to be regarded as a stage succeeding a former condition of zoölotry and totemism without notice of which its details cannot be understood.

Most peoples sacrificed to their divinities animals taken from their flocks, plants, fruits and herbs. People who had no domestic animals offered those taken in the hunt. The Indians offered the maize from their fields and the animals of the chase, and threw into the fire or water tobacco, or other herbs which they used in the place of tobacco. Sometimes these objects were hung up in the air above their huts. The northern Algonquins tied living dogs to

high rods and let them expire. In a similar manner other Indians stuck up a deer, especially a white deer, on poles. The plains tribes gave the same elevation to the head or skin of an albino buffalo on mounds, not having poles convenient. The spotless red heifer of the Israelites may be compared with the spotless white of the animals of the chase.

The southern Indians always threw a small piece of the fattest of the meat into the fire when eating or before they began to eat. They commonly pulled their newly-killed venison several times through the smoke of the fire, perhaps as a sacrifice and perhaps to consume the life spirit of the animal. They also burned a large piece and sometimes the whole carcass of the first buck they killed either in the winter or the summer hunt. The Muskoki burn a piece of every deer they kill.

The Israelites offered daily sacrifice in which a lamb (except the skin and entrails) was burned to ashes. In some of their sacrifices there was not only distinction between animals that were fit and unfit, but in the manner of treatment. Sometimes the victim was not to be touched, but should be entirely consumed by fire. In others the blood should be sprinkled around the altar and the fat and the entrails burned, the remainder of the body to be eaten by the priests. But it was a crime to eat flesh that had been offered in sacrifice to a false god.

The offering of the first fruits and therefore of the first born, to the divinity, was one of the oldest ideas of the Semites. Moloch and Jahveh were conceived as being the fire, devouring that which was offered to it, so to give food to the fire was to give to the god. In time, a substitute was suggested; the first born was replaced by an animal or a sum of money. This was called the "money of the lives."

Adair says that at the festival of the first fruits the southern Indians drank plentifully of the "cusseena" and other bitter liquids, to cleanse their bodies, after which they bathed in deep water, then went sanctified to the feast. Their annual expiation of sin was sometimes at the beginning of the first new moon in which their corn became full-eared, and sometimes at the accidental season of harvest. They cleansed their "temple" and every house in the village of every supposed polluting thing, carrying out the ashes from the hearths. They never ate nor handled any part of a new harvest till some part of it had been offered up; then they had a

long fast "till the rising of the second sun," taking their emetic drink. On the third day of the fast the holy fire was brought out and it was produced, not from any old fire, but by the rubbing of sticks. From this it was distributed to the people.

Lafiteau says that the first animal the young hunter kills he burns with fire as a sacrifice. Another festival was a kind of holocaust, where nothing of the victim was left, but must all be consumed, even to the bones, which were burned. There were also feasts of first fruits.

The Dakotas allowed no particle of the food at one of their religious feasts to be left uneaten. All bones were collected and thrown in the water that no dog might get them or women trample over them. It was common among many of the tribes that no bones of the beast eaten should be broken. There is no doubt that this is connected with zoölotry and was intended to prevent anger on the part of the ancestral or typical animal, the result of which would be the disappearance of the game. There were many other ceremonies of the same kind. When the Mandans had finished eating at any time they presented a bowlful of the food to a buffalo head, saying, "Eat this," evidently believing that by using the head well the living buffalo would still come and supply them with meat.

It is probable that what the authors have called the "day of atonement" or "expiation" was really a general wiping-out of offences or settlements of accounts between individuals and particularly between clans, after which there should be no reprisal. This is illustrated by a peculiar ceremony among the Iroquois, strongly resembling the scapegoat of the Israelites. A white dog, before being burned at the annual feast, was loaded with the confessions or repentings of the people, represented by strings of wampum. The statute of limitations then began to operate.

In the Jahvistic version, the Passover, an old festival held in the spring, was historically connected with the departure from Egypt. The ceremonies are too well known to require narration, but will readily be compared with those of the Indians.

Incense.—The use of the incense among Indians was the same as among Israelites, *i. e.*, to bring, and to please the spirit addressed. A genuine instance among the Iroquois was where tobacco was offered so late as 1882 and in archaic formal language still preserved, translated as follows :

Address to the fire. "Bless thy grandchildren, protect and strengthen them. By this tobacco we give thee a sweet-smelling sacrifice and ask thy care to keep us from sickness and famine."

Address to the thunder. "O grandfather! thou large voiced, enrich and bless thy grandchildren; cause it to rain so that the earth may produce food for us. We give this tobacco as thou hast kept us from all manner of monsters."

The Dakotas not only burned tobacco in their buffalo medicine to bring the herds, but used scented grass. Other tribes burned the leaves of the white cedar. These forms of incense were also used to entice the inimical spirits, the shaman being supposed to be able, when they had arrived in the form of a bear or some other animal, to kill them with his rattle. Some of the Indians believed that incense and sacrifices generally were only used for the spirits from whom they feared harm. They said it was not necessary to trouble themselves about the good spirits who were all right anyhow.

Fetiches.—Among many of the tribes of Indians there is a tribal totem (and often several clan totems) which, in later times becoming chiefly symbolic and emblematic, was once used in objective form for the most important religious purposes. Particularly, it was carried on extensive warlike expeditions. Adair, who calls it an "ark," describes it as made with pieces of wood, fastened together in the form of a square, to be carried on the back. It was never placed on the ground nor did the bearers sit on the earth when they carried it. In many other tribes it was a bag of skins and its contents varied, but generally were "blessed" or "sacred" fragments of wood, stone or bone. Among the Omaha it was a large shell, covered with various envelopes and was never wholly exposed to sight, which would occasion death or blindness.

A custodian was appointed every four years by the old men of the Blackfeet, to take charge of the sacred pipe, pipestem, mat and other implements which he alone could handle.

The ark of the Israelites was probably derived from the Egyptians who had a real ark, which was carried on the shoulders of the priests in processions. When the exodus began the Egyptian ark, for convenience, was changed into a chest fitted with staves for bearers. It became the standard of their warring and wandering life.

In addition to what has been called the ark or tribal fetich, the

practice that each Indian had his own mystery-bag is to be compared with the Israelite teraph which was a family or tutelary feticch independent of the national worship and frequently was the subject of later denunciation. It was probably made of carved wood, often carried on the person, but was generally held as a household god or domestic oracle. The teraphim markedly resembled the Roman penates.

This comparison is explanatory of the statement that neither the Israelites nor the Indians made idols. Its truth depends upon what is considered to be an idol. If the definition is limited to the human form, the assertion is true, because their religion was not anthropomorphic; but fetiches were certainly the objects of worship, the recrudescient forms of which, appearing even in civilization, have been amulets, lucky stones, pieces of wood and charms.

Sabbath.—It is not possible, in discussing the Israelites, to neglect the institution of the Sabbath. The four quarters of the moon made an obvious division of the month, and wherever the new moon and full moon are made religious occasions there comes a cycle of fourteen or fifteen days, of which the week of seven or eight days forms half. It is significant that in the older parts of the Hebrew Scriptures the new moon and the Sabbath are almost invariably mentioned together. Among the Israelites and perhaps among the Canaanites, from whose speech they borrowed, joy on the new moon became the type of religious festivity in general. There is an indication that in old times the feast of the new moon lasted two days, so that an approximation to regular recurrence of the subdivisions constituting the week was gained. The Babylonians and Assyrians had an institution dividing the month into four parts, by which, on the days assigned, labor was forbidden; but originally the Israelites' abstinence from labor was only incidental to their not working at the same time that they were feasting. While nomads, with only intermittent work, they had no occasion for a fixed day of rest.

The new moons were at least as important as the Sabbath until the seventh century before Christ. When the local sacrifices were abolished and the rites and feasts were limited to the central altar which practically could only be visited at rare intervals, the general festival of the new moon ceased. The Sabbath did not, but with the abolition of local sacrifices it became an institution of law

divorced from ritual. The connection between the week of seven days and the work of creation is now recognized as secondary. The original sketch of the decalogue probably did not contain any allusion to the creation, and it is even doubtful whether the original form of Genesis distributed creation over six days.

Subsequent history of the Sabbath shows a reflex action between religion and sociology. Religion prevailed against better arrangements for periods of rest. Sociology used religion to get what it could.

The Indians reached the first part only of the inception of the Sabbath in the ceremonies of the new moon, which were to them of great importance.

Circumcision.—This, generally regarded as a distinctive mark of the Israelites, is by no means peculiar to them, did not originate with them, and is found in so many parts of the world with such evidences of great antiquity as to contravene its attribution to them. Its origin is a subject of great dispute. As practised indiscriminately in infancy, it may perhaps, be a surgical blunder. It is certain that it was not at first among the Israelites a religious rite. The operation was not performed by the priesthood, but by a secular person of skill, without ceremony. It afterwards was regarded as an initiatory ceremony, and as such its parallels may be found all over the world, but as a special national distinction the declared object was not accomplished. Besides the Egyptians, Arabs and Persians, the coincidence with whom might be expected, many tribes of Africa, Central and South America, Madagascar and scores of islands of the sea show the same mark, and it has even been found in several of the North American tribes. The sole motive for alluding to this very comprehensive subject is to correct the popular belief that the custom is peculiar to the Israelites.

Parallel myths.—The Indian myths and legends supporting and explaining the religious opinions and practices before mentioned have a startling resemblance to those of the Israelites. It is not necessary to mention the deluge legends, which are common all over the world, at least in countries where inundations have occurred, and no more than general interest attaches to the mythical teacher, an inspired man or benevolent god in shape of man, who taught all that is known about hunting, fishing, the properties of plants, picture-writing and indeed every art, and founded institu-

tions and established religions, after which he generally disappeared, his actual death being seldom established. The legends of Michabo, Ioskeha, Hiawatha, Wasi and Manabosho will occur to all students as showing their analogue in Moses. A point of peculiar moment, however, is that the myths referred to are so strikingly identical in their minute details with those of the Israelites, even after all care has been taken to eliminate European influence and to assure their aboriginal antiquity.

An Ojibwa tradition tells the adventures of eight, ten and sometimes twelve brothers, the youngest of whom is the wisest and the most beloved of their father and especially favored by the high powers. He delivers his brothers from many difficulties, brought about by their folly and disobedience. Particularly, he supplies them with corn. A variant statue of Lot's wife, in stone instead of in salt, is still shown near the Mississippi River. The Chahta have an elaborate story of their migrations in which they were guided by a pole leaning in the direction to which they should go and remaining vertical where they should camp. A still closer resemblance to the guidance of the Israelites in the desert is in the migrations of the Tusayan where indication was made by the movement and the halting of a star. The Pai Utes were supported in a great march through the desert by water continually filling the magic cup until all were satisfied; and a similarly miraculous supply of food to starving exodists is reported.

Among the Ojibwa traditions there is a variant of the conception that man could not look upon the form of a divine being and live. In this case the divine beings were obliged to wear veils, and when one of them unintentionally let his eyes fall upon the form of a man the latter instantly fell dead as if struck by lightning.

The Medawe rite was granted the Ojibwa at the time of a great trouble through the intercession of Manabosho, their universal uncle, and rules of life were given them at the same time, which are represented in hieroglyphs on birch bark. They have a resemblance in motive to the Biblical legends and laws. At the time of a great pestilence, which was when the earth was new, the Ojibwa were saved by one of their number to whom a spirit, in the shape of a serpent, revealed a root which to this day they name the "snake-root," and the songs and rites of that medicine are incorporated in the Medawe.

Mr. Warren mentions that sometimes he translated to the old

Ojibwa men parts of Bible history, and their expression invariably was : "The book must be true, for our ancestors have told us similar stories generation after generation since the earth was new."

Last year a well informed representative of the Muskoki, in Washington, answered questions about the myths and legends of his people by the simple remark : "They are all in the Old Testament. Read them there without the trouble of taking them down from our people."

SOCIOLOGY.

The golden age of the Israelites, as recorded in compliance with tradition, was that ending with the Judges, when the people, without a monarchy, lived in a state nearest the ideal under a supposed theocracy, which also was a later idea. The exploits of Gideon, Jephtha and Samson are grand pictures of antiquity equal and similar to those in the Homeric poems. If the Indians could have written about their own past they would have portrayed a similar golden age, which, in fact, is mirrored in their traditions and myths. But from the absence of flocks and herds they were never in a true pastoral or nomadic state, and therefore never in the absolute patriarchal stage.

The Dakota, Comanche and some other tribes became adventitiously nomads only after the introduction of the horse by Europeans, afterwards supplemented by firearms. The large majority of the Indians never saw a horse until centuries after the Columbian discovery. So the pastoral stage, which among the Israelites accelerated their transition from savagery to barbarism, was not experienced by the Indians; and supposing that the two bodies of people were at one time equally advanced in culture, it might well have required three thousand years longer for the Indians to reach the stage in which they were discovered than for the Israelites to have arrived at the culture shown in the days of the Judges. At the time taken for proper comparison, both peoples were living under the clan or totemic system.

A clan is a body of kindred in which kinship is established by laws now long disused, and so strange to our present ideas as to be comprehended with difficulty. Some of the more salient features of the system appear in the division of the people into tribes interpermeated by the clans, with special rules of government, adoption, protection, punishment, property and marriage.

The totemic stage was first intelligently noticed, and yet has its typical representation, among the aborigines of America and Australia. Among the latter it is called kobong. An animal or a plant, or sometimes a heavenly body is connected with all persons of a certain stock, who believe that they are the descendants of it as their totem, their protecting daimon, whose name they bear. The line of descent is normally from the mother. When a clan becomes dominant its totem daimon may come to command the worship of all the clans or tribes in the group, the other gods becoming subordinate.

The clan system lately found in actual force in two large geographic divisions of the world has preserved a clue to the mouldered maze of man's early institutions. What is known of the clans, tribes and league of the Iroquois explains what, until recently, was mystical about the tribes of Israel.

Each clan or tribe had a badge or totem from which it was named, generally an animal, as eagle, panther, buffalo, bear, deer, raccoon, tortoise, a snake or a fish, but sometimes one of the winds and other noticeable phenomena.

The Israelites had their standards. It is not probable that the blessings of Jacob and of Moses, referring to them, were merely metaphoric. In the former, Judah is named as a lion, Issachar as an ass, Dan as a serpent, Naphtali as a hind, Benjamin as a wolf, Joseph as a bough. In Moses' blessing four of such names occur—Ephraim as a bullock, Manasseh as a bison, Gad as a lion, and Dan as a lion's whelp. The inference is strong that these were the leading totems in the several tribes, and the slight disagreements in the lists may be accounted for by the fact that the head clan in Dan had changed in the interval.

David seems to have belonged to the serpent stock. The most prominent among his ancestors bore a serpent's name. Some circumstances in his life show his connection with a serpent totem.

Critics have doubted whether Moses was so opposed to idolatry as asserted later, for a brazen serpent, perhaps an ancient idol of Jahveh, said to have been set up by him, was in existence until the reign of Hezekiah who broke it into pieces. It is true that it might have been an idol of Jahveh, perhaps worshipped as a teraph, but it might have been simply a totem. The erection of the brazen serpent by Moses in the wilderness may be more consistently explained by totemism than by idolatry in its usual sense.

Government.—The powers of Israelite rulers were conferred on emergencies and were intended to be of short duration, but while they lasted were dictatorial. The Judges were despots without a standing army or an organized government. Their selection was due neither to descent, to suffrage, to feudal investiture, nor to violence, but was from the man's superiority, his ascendancy, strength and courage. It was rare for a man thus invested with power to be deprived of it before his death.

The alliance of the tribes was loose. They seldom hesitated to war upon one another. Even after nationality had been initiated the genius of David and the magnificence of Solomon could not permanently weld them together, and doubtless they would have temporarily fallen back into the incoherent state from which the Indians never emerged but for the late and conservative establishment of Jahvism which the Indians did not have.

The characteristics of the Israelite and of the Indian, as of the Homeric Achæans, were predatory—the tribe and its clans, with their alliances, against the rest of the world.

In the investigation of totemism among the Israelites it is important to compare its continued existence in Arabia because the state of society there remains more primitive than it was in the land of Israel when the Old Testament was written.

A large number of tribes having animal names are still found among the Arabs, for instance, Lion, Wolf, Ibex, She-fox, Dog, Bull, Ass, Hyena and Lizard. The origin of all these names is referred by the people to an ancestor who bore the tribal or gentile name. Also the animal names given in the tribal genealogies are often found belonging to sub-tribes, the same animal sometimes occurring in subdivisions of different tribes, these particulars corresponding with the Indian system.

The tribes of the southern and eastern parts of Canaan had affinities both to Israel and to the Arabs. The Arab princes of Midian were the Raven and the Wolf—heads of tribes of the same names. More than one-third of the Horites, the descendants of Seir the he-goat, bear animal names; so do the clans of the Edomites. It is disputed what the real name of Moses' father-in-law was; but he had some connection with the Kenites. The list in Genesis xxxvi, is a count of tribal or local divisions and not a literal genealogy. It is full of animal names, and the antelope stock was divided over the nation in a way only to be explained on the totemic and not

a genealogic system. The same names appearing as totem tribes in Arabia, reach through Edom, Midian and Moab into Canaan where they show local distribution, only intelligible on the assumption that the totem system prevailed there also when the first books of the Old Testament were written.

Professor Robertson Smith gives a select list of about thirty persons and towns bearing names derived from animals and plants. Dr. J. Jacobs has expanded this into one hundred and sixty such names, though their importance is considered by him to be lessened by the frequency of such names in England, forgetting, apparently, that the clan system also existed among the ancestors of the English people.

The tribe of Judah received the powerful accession of the Dog tribe, the Calebites, among whom there were many animal names.

With such facts, and the knowledge that the early Israelites freely intermarried with the surrounding nations, it is to be supposed that the totemic system of those neighbors should appear in all Israel, as was obviously the case in Judah.

The 26th chapter of Numbers gives the clans of the tribes. Altogether seventy-two clans are mentioned, and of these at least ten occur in two tribes, striking among whom are the Arodites or Wild Ass clan, found both in Gad and in Benjamin. Other clans also have animal names; the Shillimites or Fox clan, of Naphtali; the Shuhamites or Serpent clan, of Benjamin; the Bachrites, or Camel clan, of Ephraim and Benjamin; the Elonites, or Oak clan, of Zebulun; the Tolaites, or Worm clan, of Issachar; and the Arelets, or Lion clan, of Gad.

A special suggestion comes from the tribe of Simeon. In the blessing of Jacob, Simeon is coupled with Levi as a tribe scattered in Israel. There were Simeonites in the south of Judah, but they do not appear there as an independent local tribe. According to Genesis XLIX, there must have been branches of the tribe elsewhere. It would seem that Simeon remained as a divided stock, having representatives through the female line in the different local groups. When the old system was displaced, Simeon lost importance and ultimately dropped from the list of tribes. The name of the tribe was lost but not the people, as has been noticed in careful statistical examination of the Indians.

In the stage of barbarism man belongs not to himself, but to his

clan and tribe. In civilization responsibility is personal, and there can be no crime without a criminal intent. This was not so in the clan system, so the rules of obedience, punishment and protection were peculiar.

Clan Punishment.—The Indian punishments known were death or expulsion from the tribe, the latter, from the unprotected state of the offender, being tantamount to death. The code consisted in the application of the *lex talionis*. The vengeance of blood for homicide was exacted as a clan duty. This was executed by the clan of the person killed, generally by the nearest of clan kinship, and it was required even if the death were by accident, unless condoned by payment. Among the Israelites, as among the Indians, the duty of blood revenge appears to have lain on the kin by the mother's side.

Sanctuary.—The fact that no crimes could be individual, but were against a clan by a member of a clan, rendered it necessary to have some special provision to restrict vengeance; so the right of sanctuary, which appeared later as a prerogative of religion, was in its origin sociologic.

The avenger of blood among the Indians generally had the right to slay the criminal if found within a specified time, such as two days, after the act; but if he should escape that long the avenger could no longer pursue and was himself liable if he should persevere. The clan at that stage interfered, and there were among some tribes localities (called by Adair the "Cities of Refuge") designated, in which the criminal should be safe from minor offences until the general wiping-out of vengeance at the next annual festival. Compare Numbers xxxv, 12: "And they shall be with you cities of refuge from the avenger, that the man-slayer die not until he stand before the congregation in judgment."

The functions of the avenger of blood are only referred to in the Pentateuch, but were well known in ordinary cases. The law treats of the exceptional circumstances of an accidental homicide. There is a trace, in Deuteronomy xxiii, of the general communal sanctuary in Israel. It enacts that any town or village shall be an asylum for an escaped slave. In Exodus xxi, the altar (presumably any one of the numerous village altars) is mentioned as a refuge. In the cities of refuge the sanctuary was used only for the mitigation of the revenge of blood, as Israel retained the old *lex talionis*.

A mode of bringing to notice the barbarian stage of the Israel-

ites at the time mentioned, is to translate into English familiar personal names from the Old Testament, such as the Dog, the Dove, the Hyena, the Lion's Whelp, the Strong Ass, the Adder, the Running Hind. This brings into immediate connection the English translation of Indian names, such as Big Bear, White Buffalo, Wolf, Red Cloud, Black Hawk, Fox, Crow and Turtle. It is possible that in addition to gentile derivations (for the Israelites in that sense were Gentiles), a reason for the adoption of such names was that they could be represented objectively, as is certainly the case among the Indians, who possess very few names that cannot be represented in pictographs; and the very large topic of tattooing is connected with this device antecedent to writing. The compilers of the Old Testament probably desired to break down a former practice as is shown in Leviticus xix, 28: "Ye shall not print any marks upon you." And there are other similar indications.

Adoption.—The early history after the exodus shows many cases of adoption from among the neighboring tribes, in which the captive or the stranger adopted became a member of one of the clans for the same reason as among the Indians, as otherwise he could have no status.

Caleb is first known as the son of Jephunneh, the Kenezite. Next he appears as a chief of the tribe of Judah; finally, in the book of Chronicles, his foreign descent is lost. He becomes Caleb, the son of Hezron, the son of Judah. This is an instance of adoption and is not contradictory, as Caleb could have no place in the tribe except by adoption. He is first described in accordance with the actual facts of his descent, but when adopted with his family and followers forming probably a sub-clan, he would be called by the name of the family that adopted him.

The whole population of the country which, according to Deuteronomy, was to have been exterminated, slowly became amalgamated with the invaders. In this way alone their rapid increase can be accounted for.

Not until the late prophetic influence was the doctrine established that no quarter should be shown to the enemy and no alliance made with the Goim, a word meaning the "nations", with the implication of "heathen", the use of which dates from the ninth century B. C. It is gratifying to believe that the stories of the wholesale extermination and cruel outrages injected into the historical narrative were afterthoughts intended to be examples for

the future and that they never occurred in fact. Otherwise the brutality of the Israelites to the conquered would have been more horrible than that of the Indians among whom captivity was tempered by adoption.

An interesting custom of the Indians connected both with the rite of sanctuary and that of adoption is that when captives had run through what was called by English writers "the gauntlet" to a post near the council house, they were for the time free from further molestation. It is possible that in the northeastern tribes this was in the nature of an ordeal to discover whether or not the captive was vigorous and brave enough to be adopted into the tribe; but among other tribes it appears in a different shape. Any enemy, whether or not a captive, could secure immunity from present danger if he could reach a similar post, or if there were no post, the hut of the chief. A similar custom existed among the Arikara who had a special pipe in a "bird-box". If a criminal or enemy succeeded in smoking the pipe contained in the box he could not be hurt. This corresponds with the safety found in laying hold of the horns of the altar.

Land.—In the earlier history of the Israelites there could be no individual property in land—it belonged to the clan as it did among the Indians. When arriving at sedentary and national life an expedient was invented to compromise the permanent possession of land by the clan, with individual rights of occupancy, which would allow of a proper stimulus for improvements. This was done by the institution of the Sabbatical year, or the year of Jubilee. The Indians, not having reached the sedentary stage (except in rare instances), were not obliged to invent that device. The similarity remains, therefore, that no man could acquire an absolute property in land. The title was not in him but in his clan.

Forbidden food.—The Indians long observed a prohibition of eating any part of the animal connected with their totem, and of course also of killing it. For instance, most of the southern Indians abstained from killing the wolf; the Navajo do not kill bears, the Osages never killed the beaver until the skins became valuable for sale. Afterwards some of the animals previously held sacred were killed, but apologies were made to them at the time, and in almost all cases a particular ceremony was observed with regard to the reservation of certain parts of those animals from food, on the principle of synecdoche, considering the part to rep-

resent the whole, the temptation of using the food being too great to permit entire abstinence. The Cherokee reserved the tongue of the deer and bear from food, which they cut out and cast into the fire. An instance, reported this year as still existing among the Ojibwa, is in point, where there is a formal reservation, yet by a subdivision among the same clan, an arrangement is made in which sub-clans may among them eat the whole animal. A bear is killed; the head and paws are eaten by those who are one branch of the bear totem, and the remainder is reserved for others. There is a common differentiation in which some persons can eat the ham and not the shoulder and others the shoulder and not the ham of certain animals.

The Egyptians did not allow the eating of animals that bore wool. This is attributed to the sacred character of the sphinx, and has other religious connections. It is supposed by some writers that the legislation of Moses with reference to forbidden food, was to antagonize social union with the Egyptians by permitting to the Israelites articles not used by the Egyptians, and *vice versa*. It is true that some forbidden food of the one nation was allowed to the other, but the abstinence of both from swine is not consistent with the hypothesis.

The survival of totemism may be inferred from the lists of forbidden food in Leviticus xi, and Deuteronomy xiv. It would appear that about the time of the exodus the Israelites were organized on the basis of families or clans tracing through female lines, and named Hezir (swine), Achbor (mouse), Aiah (kite), Arod (wild ass), Shaphan (coney), and so on. Each of the clans refrained from eating the totem animal or only ate it sacramentally. As the totem organization declined, the origin of the abstinence would be lost, but the custom lasted, and when the legislation was codified it was incorporated in the code. The hypothesis would explain certain anomalies in the list; *e. g.*, coney, or rock badger, for which no other deserving attention has been given. The division into clean and unclean food by the two tests of cloven foot and rumination was a later induction from the animals regarded as tabu. This is confirmed by the want of any systematization in the list of birds given in Leviticus.

It would be expected that animal names were connected with the animal worship before mentioned, and there is some evidence that men, bearing a common animal stock name, though in different

tribes or nations, recognized a unity of stock. Our most definite information on the subject is derived from Ezekiel, chapter VIII, where there seems to be an account in which the head of each house acted as priest, and the family or clan images, which are the objects of idolatry, are those of "unclean" reptiles or quadrupeds, *i. e.*, those which are prohibited from use as food. It is true that the argument of Professor Smith on this subject is controverted by Doctor Jacobs, but only as to the survival, not as to the early existence of the cult.

No one has yet given a satisfactory theory of the Israelite division between clean and unclean animals, apart from the explanation afforded by the totemic system. No rational motive can be assigned for the avoidance of certain animals, in themselves hygienically good. The explanation that swine's flesh was liable to bring disease, and therefore was prohibited for a sanitary reason only, covers but a small part of the subject and is not in itself satisfactory. The meat of the hog is, in fact, as wholesome in Syria as it is in Cincinnati, and the medical conception of trichinosis had certainly not arisen in the times under consideration. The avoidance of all meat, indeed of all food, for purposes of fasting and producing ecstasy, is in a different category and has already been mentioned.

Marriage.—The laws of marriage in the stage of barbarism are intricate, but attention may be directed to a few points which strongly distinguish its features from those in civilization. Its most general characteristic is that it was strictly by legal appointment. The levirate, named from the word *levir*, a husband's brother, is in brief, the practice by which it is the combined right and duty of a brother—often the eldest surviving brother—to marry the widow of his deceased brother. Prof. E. B. Tylor reports that this practice appears among one hundred and twenty peoples; *i. e.*, in about one in three of the distinct peoples of the world. It was almost universal among the Indians, sometimes with additional duties and privileges. A widow, as a rule, could not marry any one but her deceased husband's brother except on his refusal or after a long time of mourning.

In several tribes the marrying of an elder sister gave rights over all the others; and sometimes the son-in-law, especially when he married the eldest daughter, became entitled to all the property of her father, and also the younger sisters of his wife if he chose.

Other men could not take them until after his refusal. This right to all the unmarried younger sisters sometimes continued after the death of the first wife. Not unfrequently a man married a widow and her daughters at once.

Among the Israelites it was common to have several wives of equal status, who often were sisters. A widow had a right to appeal to her brother-in-law, or some member of her husband's family, for a second marriage, and an evasion of the duty was a gross offence. Deuteronomy xxv shows the degrading terms of the formality by which the brother-in-law was freed from the obligations of marriage and the widow allowed to marry another man. Judah admitted that Tamar's conduct was perfectly correct. It was but a legitimate extension of the levirate law.

There is the clear statement in Leviticus that the Egyptians and the Canaanites formed such marriages as with them were connected with the totemic system but by the Israelite law were made incestuous. The laws of incest given in Leviticus are probably later than the code of Deuteronomy where the prohibition is directed against marriage with a man's father's wife. This precept denounces the practice in Arabia by which the son inherited his father's wife as his property.

In the framework of the Deuteronomic code there were three prohibitions: father's wife, sister, and wife's mother. To these offences Ezekiel adds marriage with a daughter-in-law. All those forms of quasi-incest were, according to the prophets, practised in Jerusalem; and the history seems to show that all were once recognized customs. The taking of a father's wife was not wholly obsolete in the time of David.

As regards the Israelite descent in the female line, it may be noticed that the children of Nahor by Milcah were distinguished from his children by his other wives. Rebekah's descent is practically valued as a descent from Milkah, and the family or clan connections is traced entirely through Milkah and Sarah. Moses' father married his father's sister; Nahor married his brother's daughter; Abraham married Sarah, the daughter of his father but not the daughter of his mother.

A passage in Judges relates to exogamy, recording that Ibzan had thirty sons and also thirty daughters whom he sent abroad, and took thirty daughters from abroad for his sons. Exogamy, however, could not be kept up when the Israelites became mainly an

agricultural people, and in the times of the kings only survivals of it remained.

Mr. Fenton, in his acute remarks upon the story of Lot's daughters, has not exhausted the subject. It was not only the fact that according to the clan system it was proper for Lot to marry his daughters, but under the circumstances it was obligatory upon him to do so. The logical propriety of the marriage of a father to his daughters, on the ground that they did not belong to the same clan, is clear, and the practice exists to-day among a number of the tribes of Indians not much affected by European influence. A father was not of kin to his own children. They belonged to the mother's clan, and not to his. An interesting example of this clan law is narrated by Dr. George M. Dawson as still existing among tribes of British Columbia, where a rich Indian would have nothing to do with the search for his aged father who was lost and starving in the mountains. Not counting his father as a relative, he said, "Let his people go in search of him." Yet that son was regarded as a particularly good Indian.

There are other instances where the son would fight against the father to the death. Such cases would occur where a son married, necessarily, a woman of another clan, and went to live with her people, and when there was warfare between her clan and that of his father, he was by association expected to fight against the latter, there being no reason why he should not.

It is, however, true that, in a large number of tribes of Indians, the marriage of father and daughter has been, during the time of European examination, very rare. It may be suggested as a reason that a gradual change has occurred from the mother-right to the father-right, in which the attitude is reversed; but practically the fact that, either the father or mother, by treating the daughter as an object of value or merchandise, could secure presents from the suitor, would have tended to break down this part of the clan marriage system before any other, and, the custom ceasing, the practice became wrong. So it is true to-day among Indians, as it was in a much more marked degree at the time of the compilation of the existing version of the Old Testament, that the marriage of a father and daughter is reprobated. In this connection it is interesting to notice that the Navajo have a myth, undoubtedly native, that in the old time one of their race took his daughter to wife

and their offspring became the ancestor of the Utes, the hereditary enemies of the Navajo. This is a parallel with the stigma inflicted upon the Moabites and Ammonites who were the descendants of Lot and the enemies of the Israelites who wrote the history but yet were recognized by the latter as of the same stock.

The part of the story of Lot which tends strongly to show its later manipulation, is that the authors of the version, having at that time the idea of a horrible incest, explained that the good man, specially so designated by tradition, was guilty of it only because he was unconscious through intoxication. They were obliged in accordance with one tradition, to make him the ancestor of Moab and Ammon; from another tradition they had him left without any sons and no wife, the two daughters being all of his family who survived the destruction of Sodom. They used their materials, therefore, with the excuse of intoxication, but there was no occasion for such excuse. In the age to which the tradition related, the transaction was perfectly proper, does not involve sexual passion, and was required by law to keep up the stock, but the clan rules had been forgotten when the book of Genesis was written.

In the stage of barbarism the marriage of brother and sister was common all over the world. Where polygamy existed, as was the case among the Israelites, and probably among all the Indians, a man could not, according to the rules of the gentile system marry into his own clan. If he took several wives it is probable that they would sometimes be of different clans not only from his own, but from one another. In such cases the child of the wife of clan A was not of the same clan as the child of the wife of clan B, and they could marry. The marriage of uterine brothers and sisters was not consistent with the clan rules.

Writers on the subject of the clan system have extolled it as being profound with physiological insight to prevent inbreeding; but the best and latest physiologists doubt that inbreeding is bad unless there is a taint of blood which should prohibit the marriage of either party to any one; and a true understanding of the clan system would have shown that as it certainly permitted marriage between a man and his half-sister, and with his aunt, his father's sister, if not the more violent case of father and daughter, it did not accomplish the object lauded.

The late prohibition of a man's marriage to his deceased wife's

sister cannot be maintained on any principle of physiology or sociology. It is a blunder that perhaps arose in the transition stage from the matriarchate to the patriarchate system.

CONCLUSIONS.

It has often been asserted that the Semites, and specially that branch of them lately styled the Syro-Aramæans, were specially adapted to a spiritual religion; that monotheism was in their racial constitution; that whether through revelation or because they were well adapted to receive such revelation, their idiosyncrasy directly led them to spiritual ideas, which to modern minds means monotheism. This was not the record of the historical books of the Old Testament, even after their manipulation. The prophets of Israel declared the exact contrary; they denounced their own people as rejecting spiritual proof and as not deserving the favor of Jahveh. This declaration is confirmed. The beliefs and practices of the Israelites were substantially the same as those of other bodies of people in the same stage.

The Israelites were not a "peculiar" people. There is, racially, no peculiar people in the sense intended. Mankind is homogeneous in nature though placed in differing and ever advancing grades of culture. What has been called blood in a racial sense may be likened unto the water of the earth;—as it comes from the clouds it is chemically the same, and it is subjected, wherever it is, to the same laws. The early course of a rill may be turned by a pebble, and from the elevations and depressions met it may become a lake, or a river, or a stagnant marsh. From the character of soil encountered it may be clear or muddy, alkaline, chalybeate or sulphurous. In one sense, which belongs to modern and not to ancient history, the Jews are a peculiar people, from the fact that for many centuries, until lately, they proclaimed themselves to be such and observed religiously the doctrine about the Goim, and therefore did not intermarry with other peoples; but this also has been from the fact that persecution made them pariahs and the other peoples would not intermarry with them. The so-styled purity of their race has been kept up by isolation during the recent centuries, but the assumption of great purity in the stock at the Christian era is not tenable, and now that their prejudices and those against them are dissolving, it is probable that what has been improperly called the Jewish race will disappear by absorption in precisely the same man-

ner that the Indians are now disappearing. To renew the simile, they both will be lost in the homogeneous ocean which all mankind seems destined to swell.

I do not enter upon the controversy respecting the races of mankind except to confess, as the sum of my own studies on the subject, that all attempts at the classification of races have failed. The best generalization may be taken from the address of Professor Flower to the Section of anthropology of the British Association for the Advancement of Science: "I am compelled to use the word race vaguely for any considerable group of men who resemble each other in certain common characters transmitted from generation to generation." The most useful mode for the examination now of peoples by anthropologists is not by attempts at racial divisions, but by the determination of their several planes of culture with the recognition of specific environments. Admission of this fact is practical. The most sensible remarks ever made by missionaries were those of the Rev. Messrs. Lee and Frost who, after ten years in Oregon of what has been considered successful work, announced their abandonment of their former belief that if the heathen were converted to Christianity civilization followed of course. They confessed that civilization must begin before Christianity could even be understood. Acute travellers throughout the world have perceived the same fact, and it is not a too violent simile to say that Christianity, belonging to the plane of civilization and to that only, sits on a savage or barbarian as a bishop's mitre would on a naked Hottentot.

Moses did not change the Israelites from their barbarian condition. It was not possible. As regards the culture strata we may take a lesson from geology. Coal is not found in the Silurian formation, therefore wise miners do not look there for coal. The higher mammals are not found earlier than the Cenozoic, though their precursors are in the Jurassic. Let us look in the savage stage as if it were Jurassic to understand and trace what we may afterwards find in the barbarian or Cenozoic, and developed later in the present epoch; but to search for the complete ideas of civilization in the period of barbarism would be as sensible as to dig for manuscripts among the workshops of flint arrowheads.

There is a Rabbinical legend that Lot first argued the existence of one god ruling the universe, from the irregular phenomena observed on land and sea and among the heavenly bodies. "If these

had power of their own," he said, "they would have had regular motions, but as they had no regularity they were subservient to the occasional exercise of a higher will." With greater scientific knowledge these supposed irregular motions are now embraced within laws considered to be permanent, if not immutable; but the existence of such tremendous laws gives a higher conception of their maker. Their suspension or violation is not in accordance with human reason, and mere suggestion of such variations clouds the glory of divinity.

The doctrine attributed to Lot is instructive, because its conception of nature permeated all the early philosophy. We now define a miracle specifically as a deviation from the laws of nature. But to those for whom nature had no laws, the prime definition as "the wonderful" was alone correct. A supernatural being could, and was expected to, do anything whatever in accordance with his arbitrary will, and men who were inspired or empowered by the supernatural were also expected, in fact required, to work wonders. It would hardly be a paradox to assert that the supernatural was alone natural and that in the explanation of phenomena only the irregular was regular.

The order of the evolution of revelation, as may be appreciated by every student regarding all revelations but that one which he credits, is that some practice existed early for which a natural explanation may be made. This practice became a formal custom which, after a time, was considered to be obligatory under the vague but compelling idea that it is "bad luck" not to observe it. Bad luck is necessarily connected with the supernatural, therefore the custom or the series of customs became a religion, and that was always explained at a later time by a myth which was not necessarily an explanation made by imposture or fraud, but grew from the curiosity of men and their hurry to account for everything. All such myths are declared to be obtained, through revelation, from a power higher than man. The result is, therefore, that revelation, which is the last step in the evolution of religion, is enounced by antedating, to be the first step. When revelation is once admitted, man's mind clings to it as a refuge from doubt which always must attend the results of reasoning on subjects not admitting of demonstration. Such clinging becomes fanatical with most men because they dread as the greatest injury to be cast into the hands of the Giant Doubting who for them is but another name for Giant Despair.

There is also a sentiment involved that the old thought, that of the ancestors, is always the best. This is incorrect unless on the theory that all knowledge comes from revelation. The continuance of the old is bad because it is old and is maintained through superstition in the true etymological sense of the word. Some advocates of the old reject all new thoughts, but the more intelligent attempt to force a reconciliation. What they believe now must be right. What they are not accustomed to is shocking, therefore is wrong. So the old, which was always right, must be distorted to contain in it the new which also is right, and what there is in the old that cannot be managed otherwise must be explained away.

An apparent exception to the unfitness of old direct teachings is where there has been a general degradation in culture after which a return to the results of the former and forgotten culture is most desirable. This is illustrated in the revival of learning after the dark ages in Europe when the classic writings as discovered and studied brought new illumination to the world. But this was a simple readjustment of sequence after a hiatus. The advance of development, not chronology, makes the proper criterion. The archaic is that which is nearest the beginning of human life. We have the history of the Israelites for forty centuries; we have that of the Indians for little more than three centuries; yet though the Israelites advanced in recorded times beyond the plane of the Indians, who shall say which of these was the older people?

He would be both silly and malicious who should impugn my treatment of the present subject as a direct or covert attack upon the books of the Old Testament. On the contrary, I regard that noble work as the most important anthropologic record possessed by man, richly repaying such study and comparison as all valuable records demand. I gladly accept it as a genuine account, and believe that though it has been colored by time and by the work of man, it never was invented, and is not to be treated as a literary or religious fabrication. It is asserted that some persons occupied in science fear or pretend to scorn the Bible. I do neither. I admire it, and study it, and gain much from it; but no intelligent persons take as of the same authority all its versions or indeed all the contents of the books arbitrarily styled canonical on the very names and numbers of which churches and sects dispute.

The Hexateuch contains the same intrinsic evidence of truth as was obvious to the Ojibwa, before mentioned, who said that the

work was true because they and their fathers "had heard the same stories since the world was new." To those who can read it understandingly it is a true story of a plane of culture. But when we find that distinct revelations have been and are claimed by all the tribes of men in that plane of culture we are forced to recall the words of the sage who gave as the reason for his disbelief in ghosts that he had seen too many of them.

"Now as to myself I have so described these matters as I have found them and read them, but if any one is inclined to another opinion about them, let him enjoy his different sentiments without any blame from me."

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 021 218 804 9